PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	)	
	:	Examiner: Chad Dickerson
MATSATO FUKUDA	)	
	:	Art Unit: 2625
Application No.: 10/660,651	)	
	:	Technology Center: 2600
Filed: September 12, 2003	)	
	:	Confirmation No. 7558
For: INFORMATION PROCESSING	)	
APPARATUS, A FUNCTION	:	
EXTENSION PROGRAM,	)	
COMPUTER READABLE	:	
STORAGE MEDIUM STORING	)	
THE PROGRAM AND	:	
INFORMATION PROCESSING	)	
METHOD	:	March 16, 2011

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

Sir:

This Brief is submitted in support of Appellant's appeal from the final

rejection of Claims 14, 16 and 17 in the above-identified application. A timely Notice of

Appeal was filed with A Pre-Appeal Brief on January 11, 2011. A Notice of Panel

Decision dated February 16, 2011 was received in response to the Pre-Appeal Brief.

Therefore, Appellant submits that this Brief is timely filed. In compliance with 37 CFR §

41.20, a fee of $540.00 is being submitted herewith.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B. Claimed Feature: "designating a first plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation, and deleting from a cache memory, based on when a second plurality of image data is designated, the image data, of the designated first plurality of image data, which is not successively designated as image data to be printed and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated." 21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes/Rules

(1) <u>REAL PARTY IN INTEREST</u>

The real party in interest herein is the assignee of record in the present application, Canon Kabushiki Kaisha.

(2)   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant, Appellant's legal representative, and the Assignee are not aware of any other related appeals or interferences which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the instant appeal.

(3)   <u>STATUS OF CLAIMS</u>

<u>Pending</u>:   Claims 14, 16 and 17, each of which are independent.

<u>Canceled</u>:   Claims 1 to 13 and 15.

<u>Rejected</u>:   Claims 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent
                Application Publication No. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead).

<u>Rejections Appealed</u>: Claims 14, 16 and 17.

(4)   <u>STATUS OF AMENDMENTS</u>

        The amendment to the claims submitted in the Response To Final Office Action dated November 15, 2010 were not entered. Therefore, the language of the claims is identical to that set forth in the Amendment dated June 30, 2010. In addition, a copy of the claims involved in the appeal is provided in the attached Claims Appendix.

(5)   SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In accordance with MPEP § 1205.02, elements recited in the claims are identified below with corresponding exemplary elements described in the specification. However, it should be understood that the claimed elements are not limited to the embodiment discussed below, or to the embodiments described in the specification.

Independent Claims 14, 16 and 17 generally concern caching and managing image data downloaded from a server device for use in processing subsequent print jobs. According to one aspect of the claims, a plurality of image data is designated to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation. The designated image data is then downloaded from the server device, and a cache memory caches the downloaded image data. When a plurality of image data is newly designated, image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed is deleted from the cache memory, and image data which is successively designated is not deleted from the cache memory. The newly designated image data is then downloaded to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device. As a result, it is possible to save time and traffic for downloading image data to be printed as well as save the storage area in the cache memory.

In one example shown in Appellant's Figs. 5, 4A and 6, an information processing apparatus (e.g. client terminal 105 of Fig. 5) communicates with a server device (e. g. server device 101 of Fig. 5) and a printer (e.g. printer 113 of Fig. 5). The information processing apparatus designates a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation (e.g. step S409 of Fig. 4A), downloads the designated image data from the server device (e.g. step S413 of

Fig. 6) and caches the downloaded image data in a cache memory included in the information processing apparatus (e.g. step S414 of Fig. 6). The information processing apparatus reads the cached image data from the cache memory and executes the print processing of the read image data (e.g. steps S415 and S416 of Fig. 6). The information processing apparatus deletes from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed (e.g. steps S411 and S704 of Fig. 6), and does not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated (e.g. step S409 of Fig. 6) and downloads the newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device (e.g. steps S412, S413 and S414 of Fig. 6).

Independent Claim 14

As claimed, independent Claim 14 is directed to an information processing (e.g. client terminal 105 of Fig. 5) apparatus communicating with a server device (e. g. server device 101 of Fig. 5) and a printer (e.g. printer 113 of Fig. 5). The information processing apparatus comprises: a designation unit (e.g. CPU 206 of Fig. 2, executing step S409 of Fig. 4A) configured to designate a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation; a downloading unit (e.g. CPU 206 of Fig. 2, executing step S413 of Fig. 6) configured to download the designated image data from the server device; a cache memory (e.g. print cache data area 101 of Fig. 5 and CPU 206) configured to cache the downloaded image data; a print processing unit (e.g. CPU 206 of Fig. 2, executing steps S415 and S416 of Fig. 6) configured to read the cached image data from the cache memory and execute print

processing of the read image data; and a deletion unit (e.g. CPU 206 of Fig. 2, executing steps S411, S702, S703 and S704 of Fig. 6) configured to delete from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated by said designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by said designation unit, when said designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data, wherein said downloading unit (e.g. CPU 206 of Fig. 2, executing steps S701, S410, S411, S702, S412, S413, S414, S415, S416, S417, S703 and S704 of Fig. 6) downloads the newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16 is directed to an information processing method performed in an information processing apparatus (e.g. client terminal 105 of Fig. 5) communicating with a server device (e. g. server device 101 of Fig. 5) and a printer (e.g. printer 113 of Fig. 5). The method comprises: designating (e.g. step S409 of Fig. 4A) a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation; downloading (e.g. step S413 of Fig. 6) the designated image data from the server device; caching (e.g. step S414 of Fig. 6) the downloaded image data in a cache memory included in the information processing apparatus; reading (e.g. step S415 of Fig. 6) the cached image data from the cache memory and executing (e.g. step S416 of Fig. 6) print processing of the read image data; deleting (e.g. steps S703 and S704 of Fig. 6) from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting (e.g. steps S411 and S702) from the cache memory the image data

which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated; and

downloading (e.g. the combined effect of steps S701, S410, S411, S702, S412, S413,

S414, S415, S416, S417, S703 and S704 of Fig. 6) the newly designated image data to be

printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

Independent Claim 17

As claimed, independent Claim 17 is directed to a computer-readable non-

transitory storage medium storing a computer-executable program (e.g. a control program

stored in ROM 207 of Fig. 2) for an information processing method performed in an

information processing apparatus (e.g. client terminal 105 of Fig. 5) communicating with a

server device (e.g. server device 101 of Fig. 5) and a printer (e.g. printer 113). The

computer-executable program comprises: a step of designating (e.g. step S409 of Fig. 4A)

a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in

response to a user operation; a step of downloading (e.g. step S413 of Fig. 6) the

designated image data from the server device; a step of caching (e.g. step S414 of Fig. 6)

the downloaded image data in a cache memory included in the information processing

apparatus; a step of reading (e.g. step S415 of Fig. 6) the cached image data from the cache

memory and executing (e.g. step S416 of Fig. 6) print processing of the read image data; a

step of deleting (e.g. steps S703 and S704 of Fig. 6) from the cache memory the image

data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting (e.g.

steps S411 and S702) from the cache memory the image data which is successively

designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated; and a step of downloading

(e.g. the combined effect of steps S701, S410, S411, S702, S412, S413, S414, S415, S416,

S417, S703 and S704 of Fig. 6) the newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

(6)   <u>GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL</u>

        1.   Whether the rejection of Claims 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §

102(e) over Holmstead should be reversed.

(7)   <u>ARGUMENT</u>

        For the procedural purposes of this Appeal only, independent Claims 14, 16 and 17 rise and fall together. These claims are being argued in this manner solely for the procedural purposes of expediting the consideration and processing of this Appeal, and without conceding the separate consideration of these claims for any other purpose, such as in litigation.

I.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14, 16 AND 17 SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE FINAL OFFICE ACTION FAILED TO PROVIDE A PRIMA FACIE CASE THAT THE DISCLOSURES OF U.S. PATENT APPLICATION PUBLICATION NO. 2004/0021905 (HOLMSTEAD) ANTICIPATED THE CLAIMS.

In the rejection of Claims 14, 16 and 17, the Office Action apparently relied on the inherency of the disclosures of Holmstead without providing either a basis in fact or technical reasoning to support the contention that Holmstead discloses the features of the claims.

A.   **Applicable Case Law**

        Consistent with case law, MPEP § 2131 provides guidelines for determining anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As stated in *Verdegaal Bros*, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Furthermore, MPEP § 2112 IV. provides in part that "(t)he fact that a certain result or

characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993), emphasis added. In addition, "(i)n relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464.

For the reasons given below the Appellant submits that the Office Action has failed to establish that Holmstead anticipates independent Claims 14, 16 and 17. It is the position of the Appellant that Holmstead does not expressly disclose all of the features of the claims and the Office Action failed to establish the inherency of those features that were not disclosed.

B. **Claimed Feature: "a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated by said designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by said designation unit, when said designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data."**

Appellant respectfully submits that the instant Office Action is deficient in that it appears to reject the pending claims of the subject application based on inherency, yet fails to provide a rationale or evidence tending to show inherency. Specifically, the Office Action, when referencing paragraph [0051] of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead), states that "(i)n the first directory, the image data is deleted or overwritten every thirty days in order to clear that memory space while the second directory maintains that information indefinitely since it is constantly being used. These

directory functions are <u>believed</u> to perform the feature of the claim limitation regarding the deletion function since data is being deleted when it is not successively used." Page 2 of the Office Action, emphasis added. However, Holmstead does not literally state that "data is deleted or overwritten...when it is not successively used". Instead Holmstead states "(f)or example, information stored in directory A **can** be overwritten (and/or erased) every thirty days, because customer A **may** print completely different materials every thirty days. Whereas, customer B **may** send very similar print job elements over an extended period of time, therefore, information stored in directory B **may** be stored indefinitely, so long as there is free memory space available in directory B." See Holmstead paragraph [0051], emphasis added. That is, Holmstead clearly states that data may or may not be overwritten and/or erased depending on the behavior of a user. Nowhere does Holmstead disclose deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated, as is actually featured in the claims.

Furthermore, as the Office Action states that it is merely "believed" that Holmstead discloses such a feature, it appears that the Office Action is relying on the inherency of the disclosures of Holmstead. However, MPEP § 2112 IV. provides in part that "(t)he fact that a certain result or characteristic <u>may</u> occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993), emphasis added. According to Holmstead, the data may or may not be overwritten and/or erased as a function of whether or not a user accesses the data. It is therefore indeterminate whether or not the operation of

the apparatus disclosed in Holmstead results in erasure of any data as such an event may or may not happen. Furthermore, "(i)n relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic <u>necessarily</u> flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464, emphasis added. As clearly stated in Holmstead, data may or not be overwritten and/or erased; therefore, it cannot be said that the feature of deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated, necessarily flows from the teachings of Holmstead on the basis of fact. Instead, if such a result is to flow at all from Holmstead, the Office Action must provide technical reasoning to reasonably support such a determination. Specifically, the Office Action must provide technical reasoning as how a teaching of data that may or not be overwritten and/or erased inherently discloses deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated, as featured in the present claims. No such technical reasoning was provided in the Office Action. Instead, the Office Action states that it is merely "believed" that Holmstead has such a feature.

As the Office Action apparently makes a rejection of the present claims based on inherency, yet fails to provide either a basis in fact or technical reasoning sufficient to provide a rationale or evidence tending to show inherency, Appellant respectfully submits the Office Action fails to meet its required burden of proof as required

by MPEP § 2112. Accordingly, Appellant submits that there is a clear deficiency in the Office Action and that the Office Action fails to provide a *prima facie* case in support of the rejection.

Appellant submits that in view of the failure of the Office Action to provide a *prima facie* case in support of the rejection, the rejection of Claims 14, 16 and 17 should be reversed.

II.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14, 16 AND 17 SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE CLAIMS 14, 16 AND 17 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY U.S. PATENT APPLICATION PUBLICATION US 2004/0021905 A1 (HOLMSTEAD) SINCE HOLMSTEAD FAILS TO DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST KEY FEATURES OF CLAIMS 14, 16 AND 17.

In the rejection of Claims 14, 16 and 17, there is at least one instance where the applied art fails to disclose or suggest claimed features.

A.   Applicable Case Law

Consistent with case law, MPEP § 2131 provides guidelines for determining anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As stated in *Verdegaal Bros*, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." More recently the Federal Circuit has stated that, as discussed in *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

For the reasons given below the Office Action has failed to establish that Holmstead anticipates independent Claims 14, 16 and 17. It is the position of the Appellant that the applied art fails to disclose or suggest key limitations of the claims, as discussed more fully below.

B.   Claimed Feature: "a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated by said designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by said designation unit, when said designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data."

Appellant respectfully submits that Holmstead fails to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 14, 16 and 17. In particular, Holmstead fails to disclose or suggest deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated.

In contrast Claims 14, 16 and 17, Holmstead discloses a system that stores print job elements in a local memory in order to reduce the amount of time used to assemble the elements in a printer for processing a print job. If a print job requires certain elements, the system searches the local memory for those elements. If the elements are not found, the elements are retrieved from an external device, such as a print server, and stored in the local memory. If the elements are found in the local memory already, the elements are reused. In addition, if an old print job element is found in memory that is nominally the same as a new print job element, but the old print job element is different in some aspect from the new print job element, the old print job element is overwritten. Furthermore, Holmstead discloses that elements may be stored in different memory areas and used by different customers. Holmstead, paragraphs [0055] to [0057]. Holmstead further discloses that a control system stores a print job element in local memory for a specified period of time as indicated in a "retain field." Holmstead, paragraph [0058]. During that specified period of time, the print job element is stored in local memory

regardless of whether or not it is successively accessed no matter how many times new print job elements are read into the memory.

In an example described in paragraph [0051] of Holmstead, information stored by customer A is overwritten every thirty days because customer A prints completely different materials every thirty days. However, information for customer B is stored indefinitely as customer B accesses the same information as customer B sends very similar print jobs referencing the same elements over an extended period of time.

By way of an illustrative example of the operation of a system in accordance with the disclosures of Holmstead, consider print job element X stored by customer A of Holmstead and print job elements Y and Z stored by customer B of Holmstead. If customer B requests a print job using print job elements Y and Z, and then requests another print job using only print job element Z, then print job element Z is used for the print job while print job element Y is retained until the end of a specified time indicated in the "retain field" of print job element Y. Furthermore, print job element X is also retained until the end of a specified time in print job element X's own "retain field" no matter how many times print job elements Y and Z are used and no matter how many times additional print job elements are used. Therefore, Holmstead merely discloses that print job elements in each directory are kept for a predetermined period of time regardless of any other conditions, but may be retained, presumably by resetting the specified time stored in the "retain field," if the print job element is subsequently used.

In order for Claims 14, 16 and 17 to be anticipated by Holmstead, each and every element set forth in each claim must be found Holmstead. See MPEP § 2131 and *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051,

1053. Appellant submits that the deletion unit of Claim 14, and the deletion steps of Claims 16 and 17, are not found in Holmstead. Holmstead discloses making an entry into a "retain field" in order to retain a print job element in memory. This "retain field" contains a specified date indicating when the print job element may be removed if it has not been accessed. That is, the print job element is held in memory until the time of the "retain field" entry.

However, Claims 14, 16 and 17 feature deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed when a plurality of image data is newly designated. Therefore, in an information processing apparatus in accordance with the present claims, image data which is not successively designated for print is deleted from the cache memory each time image data is newly designated. In Holmstead, there is no such linkage between deleting non-successively designated image data and the designation of new image data. According to Holmstead, old print job elements that are not nominally the same as new print job elements remain in memory until their respective retention dates. If there are old print job elements that are nominally the same as new print job elements, but are different in some aspect, those and only those old print job elements are overwritten by the new print job elements that are nominally the same. Any print job element stored in a directory that has not exceeded its retention date and is not nominally the same as a new print job object is retained in the directory. Therefore, there is no element found in Holmstead that corresponds to the deletion unit of Claim 14 and deletion steps of Claims 16 and 17.

Furthermore, the identical invention must be shown in Holmstead in as complete detail as is contained in Claims 14, 16 and 17. See *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor*

Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920. In rejecting Claims 14, 16 and 17, the Office Action cites paragraph [0051] of Holmstead as disclosing the deletion unit of Claim 14 and the deletion steps of Claims 16 and 17. However, the cited paragraph merely illustrates an effect achievable through the use of a system in accordance with Holmstead. The cited paragraph provides no detail regarding how such an effect might be achieved. Furthermore, the other cited portions of Holmstead disclose a mechanism that is entirely different from that which is claimed in Claims 14, 16 and 17. Namely, Holmstead discloses using a "retain field" holding a specified date to control whether or not a print job element is erased whereas Claims 14, 16 and 17 feature deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated.

In addition, the elements must be arranged in Holmstead as required by Claims 14, 16 and 17. See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566. Appellant submits that the cited portions of Holmstead do not disclose a cache memory for storing print job elements. Instead, Holmstead discloses using a directory, and more particularly, two separate directories, directory A and directory B, each directory storing independent print job elements for different customers. See Holmstead, paragraph [0051]. Therefore, Holmstead does not disclose an arrangement of a cache memory storing image data as recited in Claims 14, 16 and 17.

In addition, Claims 14, 16 and 17 recite an arrangement of a cache memory storing image data, and deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache

memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated. In the example cited from Holmstead, the two directories are operated on independently of each other to service the requests for two separate customers. In the first directory, print job elements are overwritten every 30 days simply because of customer A's requests, but customer A's operations on directory A do not affect customer B's print job elements stored in directory B. In a like manner, the print job elements in directory B are never overwritten because of the actions of customer B using directory B. Furthermore, even though in the example customer B sends very similar print job elements repeatedly, the print job elements in directory A are never used by customer B's print jobs, yet are never erased or overwritten. Therefore, the directories of Holmstead are arranged differently and used differently to reach a different effect than the cache memory of Claims 14, 16 and 17. Therefore, it cannot be said that the features disclosed in Holmstead are arranged in the same manner as the elements recited in Claims 14, 16 and 17.

CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of record are deficient for at least the foregoing reasons. Reversal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Appellant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Appellant
Registration No.: 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

(8) <u>CLAIMS APPENDIX</u>

1. to 13. (Canceled)

14. (Previously Presented) An information processing apparatus communicating with a server device and a printer, the information processing apparatus comprising:

a designation unit configured to designate a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation;

a downloading unit configured to download the designated image data from the server device;

a cache memory configured to cache the downloaded image data;

a print processing unit configured to read the cached image data from the cache memory and execute print processing of the read image data; and

a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated by said designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by said designation unit, when said designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data,

wherein said downloading unit downloads the newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

15. (Canceled).

- 28 -

16. (Previously Presented) An information processing method performed in an information processing apparatus communicating with a server device and a printer, the method comprising:

designating a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation;

downloading the designated image data from the server device;

caching the downloaded image data in a cache memory included in the information processing apparatus;

reading the cached image data from the cache memory and executing print processing of the read image data;

deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated; and

downloading the newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

17. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable non-transitory storage medium storing a computer-executable program for an information processing method performed in an information processing apparatus communicating with a server device and a printer, comprising:

a step of designating a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation;

a step of downloading the designated image data

a step of caching the downloaded image data in a cache memory included in the information processing apparatus;

a step of reading the cached image data from the cache memory and executing print processing of the read image data;

a step of deleting from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed, and not deleting from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated, when a plurality of image data is newly designated; and

a step of downloading the-newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

(9)   <u>EVIDENCE APPENDIX</u>

None.

(10)   <u>RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX</u>

None.